



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,632	09/30/2003	Ikuro Osawa	14699-018001	6067
26211	7590	05/17/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.				DESIR, JEAN WICEL
P.O. BOX 1022				ART UNIT
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				PAPER NUMBER
				2622

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,632	OSAWA, IKUO	
	Examiner Jean W. Désir	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8-13 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6,7,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/14/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griepentrog et al (US 5,587,745) in view of Skinner et al (4,802,010).

Claim 1:

Griepentrog discloses:

A vertical sharpness adjustment device (see Fig. 1, col. 2 lines 36-52) comprising:

a terminal (item 45 of Fig. 1, col. 3 lines 31-51) to which a vertical sharpness adjustment control signal is applied by a viewer of a TV receiver;

a control circuit (items 47, 45 of Fig. 1) to which the vertical sharpness adjustment control signal is applied from the terminal;

and a vertical sharpness adjustment circuit (items 38, 42, 47 of Fig. 1, col. 4 lines 28-45, col. 1 lines 41-43, col. 2 lines 36-52) which adjusts a degree of vertical sharpness adjustment on a video signal according to the vertical sharpness adjustment control signal from the control circuit;

the difference between the claimed invention and Griepentrog's disclosure is that Griepentrog does not explicitly teach that the sharpness adjustment happens in the

vertical direction. However, Griepentrog teaches sharpness adjustment according to luminance peaking signal and user control as pointed out above, and Skinner further teaches that luminance peaking signal can be used for **sharpness adjustment in either vertical or horizontal** directions (as evidence see Skinner at col. 1 lines 17-26, col. 2 lines 16-17, col. 3 lines 44-58); Thus, because of these teachings, an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention and the combination would provide, *inter alia*, sharpness adjustment in the vertical direction. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 2 is disclosed: a video input terminal to which the video signal is applied (see Skinner at col. 2 lines 16-19); a first 1H delay line (see Skinner at Fig. 1 item 12) to delay the video signal by one horizontal period; and a second 1H delay line (see Skinner at Fig. 1 item 14) to delay an output of the first delay line by one horizontal period.

Claim 3 is disclosed, see Skinner at Fig. 1 items 16, 18, 20, 22, col. 2 lines 16-32, col. 3 lines 44-58.

Claims 4, 5 are disclosed, see Griepentrog at Fig. 1 item 47, 45, 32, col. 3 lines 31-51.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-13 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 2-5.

3. Claims 8, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Griepentrog et al (US 5,587,745) in view of Skinner et al (4,802,010) and Saionji et al (US 5,561,473).

Claim 8:

The above combination does not explicitly show a comb filter, as claimed, to separate a composite video signal into a brightness (luminance) signal and a chroma (color) signal; however, Saionji clearly disclosed the claimed invention at Fig. 1, 4, which show a comb filter (item 15), as claimed, to separate a composite video signal into a brightness (luminance) signal and a chroma (color) signal; because of these teachings an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention and the combination would advantageously separate a composite video signal into brightness (luminance) signal and chroma (color) signal. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (571) 272 7344. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272 7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD
May. 14, 06



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER